



INDIANA PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

TO: Members, Indiana Professional Standards Board

FROM: Roy Weaver, Chair
Teacher Education Committee

DATE: November 28, 2001

RE: UAS Task Force Proposal

At the June 20, 2001 IPSB Board meeting a UAS Task Force was established to consider the present UAS approval process and to make recommendations for any changes in that process, if deemed necessary by the Task Force. Following is the proposal presented to the TEC on November 13, 2001 and approved.

Indiana Professional Standards Board Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

UAS TASK FORCE SUMMARY

Charge:

Examine the current Unit Assessment System (UAS) on-site visit approval process that is temporarily on hold and the tabled proposal of September 19, 2001 from Joe Weaver and Marie Theobald to the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) regarding changes to the UAS approval process to determine a solution for this situation.

Members:

Sue Blackwell (Marion), Deborah Butler (Wabash), Barbara Divins (Franklin), Tom Pickering (University of Southern Indiana), Jill Shedd (Indiana University – Bloomington), Carl Siler (Taylor University), Marilyn Watkins (Indiana University East), Joe Weaver (Indiana Professional Standards Board)

Context for Committee Deliberation:

Indiana is an NCATE partnership state and has been in the forefront nationally in the development of unit assessment systems. The work in Indiana has been the model for the NCATE 2000 Standard 2 -- *Assessment System and Unit Evaluation*. The IPSB seven UAS criteria are reflected clearly in NCATE's three elements of Standard 2 -- *assessment system; data collection, analysis, and evaluation; and use of data for program improvement*.

Given the NCATE partnership, the Task Force recognized that the NCATE Standards reflect IPSB standards and that integration of the professional and state accreditation processes would be beneficial to the Board and to the institutions. Therefore, this proposal reflects ways in which to integrate the two processes.

I. Phase One – Required Submission of UAS by June 30, 2002

- A. Receipt of UAS acknowledged to institutions and TEC in compliance with IPSB mandate of June 30, 2002 submission deadline.
- B. Upon receipt of the UAS document from each institution, the IPSB Pre-service staff completes a clerical inventory of each document to check:
 - i. each of the seven (7) criteria is addressed; and
 - ii. the content, developmental and INTASC standards are addressed.

NOTE: A checklist will be created for the inventory.

	<u>Addressed</u>	<u>Not addressed</u>
Example: Criterion #1		

Comments: _____

- C. All clerical review reports are to be completed and sent to institutions within three months. Letter mailed to each institution indicating the results of the first clerical review of the UAS document, noting, where necessary, any areas not addressed.
- D. Full report made to the IPSB Teacher Education Committee (TEC) by the IPSB Pre-service staff summarizing all of the first clerical reviews.

II. Phase Two – Formative Review of the UAS Plan

- A. Institutions submit 15-18 months in advance of their NCATE visit an Institutional Report (IR) specific to NCATE Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. Report organized around the three elements of the Standard and the IPSB seven criteria to include:
 - i. Criterion #1: updated stakeholders and their affiliations; process of stakeholders' involvement since June 30, 2002, minutes of stakeholder meetings
 - ii. Criterion #2: curriculum/assessment map or matrix
 - iii. Criterion #3: outline of process of assessment; explanation of how candidates are informed of expectations
 - iv. Criterion #4: examples of assessments (no more than three examples per benchmark)
 - v. Criterion #5: list of changes; illustrative examples; non-changes that were reviewed
 - vi. Criterion #6: flow chart; governance structure
 - vii. Criterion #7: description of process with examples (before/after examples that indicate refinements that are taking place)
- B. A formative peer review will be conducted of each plan to provide IPSB assurance of UAS implementation (core questions to be determined by TEC) and to provide institutions with constructive peer review prior to their NCATE review. The review panel will consist of three IHE representatives and one IPSB support staff.

- C. The review process will consist of:
 - i. a morning panel paper review of the Institutional Report (IR) which can be a maximum of 50 pages, elaborative documents, and a list of unresolved questions a unit may have about the UAS.
 - ii. an afternoon interview of the unit UAS designated as manager as stated in the UAS and representatives of the assessment system. As part of the review, a specific list of core questions is asked of each institution. These questions should be sent to the institution ahead of time with an explanation that there may be additional questions asked based on the paper review of the UAS plan.
- D. A written report, by standard element and criteria, sent to each unit and a copy sent to the TEC of the IPSB.

III. Phase Three – Summative Review of the UAS

- A. Acceptance of the UAS will equate to determination re: Standard 2 and will be recommended by the joint NCATE team. Criteria for an acceptable UAS will be those set by NCATE. (2002 – 2005 will reflect transitional criteria approved by NCATE.)
- B. NCATE reports submitted to IPSB for final determination of state accreditation.

NOTES:

1. As of October 2001, units will no longer provide a UAS status report to the IPSB, as this information will now be included in the NCATE report.
2. A timeline for formative reviews of unit UAS plans will be created and shared with units. This timeline will allow for a document review 12-18 months prior to the scheduled NCATE review of each unit. (This timeline will have to be shortened for those institutions that will have an NCATE review in 2002-2003.)